Dear Dave, 8/9/97

I finished going over this too late to make today's mail. About the time I finished it, as happens recently, I was suddenly very tired. That does pass off after a while. Probably part of one of the conditions I've been lucky and have survived. I think that any discussion of it should be after you've had a chance to go over what I suggest.

The content is fine. I think the presentation of it is not. In part this is that you have spent all those years trying to reach students who are not too bright and have to have things spelled out more than would ordinarily be necessary and in part the organization. Then there are also a great number of what I've referred to as formalisms, cliches, etc. that will turn any editor or publisher off and are not in any even necessary. We next turn to, we must now examine, etc. These things became obvious as you proceed and the reader does not have to be told what he will see immediately. It amounts to verbosity, too, and as Jerry has learned, publishers are increasingly trying to make books smaller to be able to sell them for less.

I think you made a serious mistake to use Carolyn Arnold as Earl Golz retailed what Tony Summers talked her into and is impossible. I had the handwritten copy of her second statement, she made corrections in it, and the last thing the FBI wanted was for her to say she had seen Oswald on the first floor. But that is in the first statement.

He told the police he ate his lunch on the first floor and saw a man named Junior walk past. Junior Jarman's testimony confirms Oswald on this. So Arnold can not be right in the Summers line that for his preconception he talked her into.

The books near the window were not a barricade and did not have to be climbed over. They were stacks piled with walking space between them. The absence of prints on the boxes could be from gloves on the hands of those laying the floor and moving those boxes but we do not know. What we do know about the prints is that Oswald's are not in any instance where they had to be if he was piling them for his own purposes. In not one instance. And there are very few.

As I've indicated I think that some of what is split and in different places in Chapter V would be better all at one point. On the rfile as I recall for one. It is much too long in its present form any way for any publisher so that is one way of saving space and words. There are many too many unnecessary words, as indicated above. Changing that style should shorten it some and I'm sure that today no editor will not object to that style.

Best,

Harold